



# THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 39, NO. 12

January 14, 1946

WHOLE NO. 1038

HORACE'S USE OF CONCRETE EXAMPLES, Concluded (Hahn)

ARISTOTLE ON METAPHOR (Greene)

AN ANCIENT INSTANCE OF TAX FORGIVENESS (Rayment)

## LATIN IN PEACE AND WAR....

War puts a premium on disciplinary subjects like Latin. Drill is vital in war, and drill in the orderly inflections of a kindred language like Latin affords the best promise to the young pupil of mastery of his native English.

The following well-tested series covers the best recommendations for the high school course:—

**FIRST YEAR LATIN** by Smith-Thompson

**LATIN WORKBOOK** by Thompson-Peters

**SECOND YEAR LATIN** by Scudder

**THIRD YEAR LATIN** by Kelsey-Meinecke

**FOURTH YEAR LATIN** by Carlisle-Richardson

**CLASSICAL MYTHS** by Herzberg

covers every allusion to mythology which occurs in the Latin Series.

## ALLYN AND BACON

Boston

New York

Chicago

Atlanta

Dallas

San Francisco

# THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Published weekly (on Monday) except in weeks in which there is an academic vacation or Armistice Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Easter, or Memorial Day. A volume contains approximately twenty-five issues.

Owner and Publisher: The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of Publication: Bennett Hall, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 4, Pennsylvania. Printed by The Beaver Printing Company, Greenville, Pennsylvania.

Edward H. Heffner, Editor, Bennett Hall, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 4, Pennsylvania.

Franklin B. Krauss, Secretary and Treasurer, The Pennsylvania State College, Box 339, State College, Pennsylvania.

Associate Editor, Wm. C. McDermott; Contributing Editors: Charles T. Murphy, J. C. Plumpe, Bluma L. Trell.

Price, \$2.00 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$2.50. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers: to subscribers 15 cents, to others 25 cents prepaid (otherwise 25 cents and 35 cents). If affidavit to invoice is required, sixty cents must be added to the subscription price. For residents of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, or the District of Columbia, a subscription to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY (or, alternatively, to The Classical Journal) is included in the membership fee of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, whose members are also entitled to The Classical Outlook and The Classical Journal at special prices in combinations available from the Secretary.

Entered as second-class matter November 7, 1945, at the Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, authorized October 14, 1938.

Volume 39 contains issues dated: October 1, 8, 15, 22, 29; November 12, 26; December 3, 10, 17 (1945); January 7, 14, 21; February 4, 18; March 4, 11, 18; April 8, 15, 29; May 6, 13, 20; June 3 (1946).

## HORACE'S USE OF CONCRETE EXAMPLES

(Concluded from page 86)

In other cases, the list of preliminary parallels is inserted simply for the sake of their similarity to the main point; or, to put it differently, we have passed from the first of my main divisions, contrast, to the second, illustration. The thought is no longer '*a, b, c*', but (unlike them, or greater than they) *D'*; it is *a, b, c*, and (like them) *D'*. Note especially the *quoque* that follows *me<sup>27</sup>* in 1.16.17-25:

ira Thyesten exitio gravi  
stravere et altis urbibus ultimae  
stetere causae cur perirent  
funditus imprimeretque muris  
hostile aratum exercitus insolens.  
compesce mentem! me quoque pectoris  
temptavit in dulci iuventa  
fervor et in celeris iambos  
misit furentem ...

and in 1.28.17-22<sup>28</sup>,

dant alios Furiae torvo spectacula Marti;  
exitio est avidum mare nautis;  
mixta senum ac iuvenum densentur funera; nullum  
saeva caput Proserpina fugit.  
me quoque devexi rapidus comes Orionis  
Illyricis Notus obruit undis.

With this *quoque* may be compared the *et* in 2.16.29-32;

abstulit clarum cita mors Achillem,  
longa Tithonus minuit senectus,  
et mihi forsitan, tibi quod negarit,  
porriget hora.

4.9.1-12 is similar, except that here Horace refers to himself first and to his parallels thereafter. The passage runs as follows:

ne forte credas interitura, quae  
longa sonantem natus ad Aufidum  
non ante vulgatas per artis  
verba loquor socianda chordis:

non, si priores Maeonius tenet  
sedes Homerus, Pindaricae latent  
Caeaque et Alcae minaces  
Stesichorique graves Camenae;  
  
nec, si quid olim lusit Anacreon,  
delevit aetas; spirat adhuc amor  
vivuntque commissi calores  
Aeoliae fidibus puellae.

The same pattern, but on a more extended scale, is found in 1.6<sup>29</sup>, where Horace names Agrippa first and then lists other heroes of comparable achievements, Achilles, Ulysses, the Pelopidae, Augustus<sup>30</sup>, Mars, Meriones, Diomedes<sup>31</sup>; and also in 1.3, where Horace's main theme, the dangers of the sea, handled in 9-24, is then paralleled by a recital of the dangers of other forbidden elements and fields—fire, air, the underworld, heaven itself<sup>32</sup>—similarly invaded by presumptuous man.

Horace's examples sometimes take the form of a series of comparisons, usually with natural phenomena, of the sort especially favored by the pastoral poets<sup>33</sup>. The simplest is a succession of similes, of the type '*a, b, c* is *D'*, or 'as *a, b, c* do or happen, so does or happens *D'*'<sup>34</sup>. Examples are 4.4.1-16<sup>35</sup>, where the warrior Drusus is compared to an eagle or a lion seizing its prey (note *qualem* in 1 and 13<sup>36</sup>); 1.37.17-20, where Augustus pursuing Cleopatra is compared to a hawk pursuing doves or a hunter pursuing a hare (note *velut* in 17); Epis. 1.1.20-26, where Horace deprived of philosophy is compared to the disappointed lover who is weary of the night, to the bound worker who is weary of the day, and to the minor constrained by his mother who is weary of the year (note *ut* in 20 and 21).

We have a general illustrative statement closely akin to a simile in 1.16.50-51:

cautus enim metuit foveam lupus accipiterque  
suspectos laqueos et opertum milius hamum,

with which C. 3.5.27-36 shows a certain likeness, especially in its second part, the parallel drawn from the behavior of the deer.

The series may consist of regularly existing or existing phenomena, the point being 'so long as *a*, *b*, *c* happens or endures, *D* will happen or endure'<sup>37</sup> as in Ep. 15.7-10:

dum pecori lupus et nautis infestus Orion  
turbaret hibernum mare,  
intonsosque agitaret Apollinis aura capillos,  
fore hunc amorem mutuum.

But more often the phenomena are improbable or impossible (*adynata*), the idea being 'so long as *a*, *b*, *c* do not happen (or until *a*, *b*, *c*, happen), *D* will not happen', as in 16.25-34<sup>38</sup>:

sed iuremus in haec: simul imis saxa renarint  
vadis levata, ne redire sit nefas;  
neu conversa domum pigeat dare lintea, quando  
Padus Matina laverit cacumita,  
in mare seu celsus procurrerit Appenninus,  
novaque monstra iunxit libidine  
mirus amor, iuvet ut tigris subsidere cervis,  
adulteretur et columba miluo,  
crecula nec ravos timeant armenta leones,  
ametque salsa levis hircus aquora.

At times, however, the reversal of nature is conceived of as actually in operation: '*a*, *b*, *c* can happen since *D* has happened'<sup>39</sup>, as in C. 1.29.10-16;

... quis neget arduis  
pronos relabi posse rivos  
montibus et Tiberim reverti,

cum tu coempts undique nobilis  
libros Panaeti Socraticam et domum  
mutare loricis Hiberis,  
pollicitus meliora, tendis?

This reversal may be due to special circumstances, such as the flood, as in 1.2.7-12, or to a special locale, such as the Blessed Isles<sup>40</sup>, as in Ep. 16.43-52.

The series takes a quite different form—that of a succession of overlapping pairs<sup>41</sup>—in C. 1.33.5-9.

insignem tenui fronte Lycorida  
Cyri torret amor, Cyrus in asperam  
declinat Pholoen; sed prius Apulis  
iungentur capreae lupis,  
quam turpi Pholoe peccet adultero<sup>42</sup>.

So far, all the examples cited<sup>43</sup> have consisted of series of concrete members serving as contrasts or as illustrations for another equally concrete, but more important, member. In many other cases, however, the important member is a general statement, usually of

philosophical import; and it is here that we have the clearest result of the teachings of Horace's father. He himself would not have ventured on these abstractions at all: 'sapiens,' says he (S. 1.4.115-116), 'vitatu quidque petitu/sit melius, causas reddet tibi.' The son has gone a step beyond him, and is ready to enter the domain of pure idea; but always his conclusions are fortified or reinforced by a host of concrete illustrations that test and prove their validity.

Sometimes he does not give his conclusions until he has presented his illustrations. Thus in Epis. 1.11 he inquires of Bullatius his impressions of various foreign cities<sup>44</sup>, with the implication that all are found wanting when tried; asks (6),

an Lebedum laudas odio maris atque viarum?; suggests (21),

Romae laudetur Samos et Chios et Rhodes absens;  
and finally arrives at his famous maxim (27),  
caelum, non animum mutant, qui trans mare  
currunt.

But this method is rare in Horace, and when used is generally combined with another, discussed earlier in this paper: the concrete examples not only lead up to a general statement, but also parallel a particularly personal one referring to Horace's main subject. Thus in S. 1.2 he begins with the extended discussion of Tigellius and Fufidius, summing these up with the aphorism (24),

dum vitant stulti vitia, in contraria currunt.

Then he treats more briefly two other pairs of extremes, Maltinus and his opposite, Rufillus and Gargoniūs (25-27), and repeats his earlier generalization by saying (28),

nil medium est ...

after this with one more instance of objectionable extremes, this time in the matter of sex relations (28-30), he comes at last to his main theme, with which he deals throughout the rest of the poem.

Horace's main subject in such cases is usually Horace himself. An excellent example is 2.1.24-29,

... saltat Milonius, ut semel icto  
accessit fervor capitī numerusque lucernis;  
Castor gaudet equis, ovo prognatus eodem  
pugnis; quot capitum vivunt, totidem studiorum  
milia: me pedibus delectat claudere verba  
Lucili ritu nostrum melioris utroque.

Horace's examination here of various individuals leads him to conclude that each man has his own hobbies and foibles, and from this he passes on to his final thought, that he himself (note the familiar emphatically placed *me* in 28) has his little peculiarity.

On the other hand in Epis. 1.7, where he uses the method on a much more extended scale, he begins instead of ending with himself, telling Maecenas that he will not accede to his request; then gives in narrative form four situations whose parallelism to his own

he allows his patron to read between the lines, the stories being those of the Calabrian and his guest, the fox and the hen, Menelaus and Telemachus, Philippus and Mena; and finally comes to his moral in the last line (98),

metiri se quemque suo modulo ac pede verum est.

Here it would not serve his purpose explicitly to apply the moral to himself and his patron; he leaves that to Maecenas's wit.

Again in C. 1.28<sup>45</sup>, he begins (1-6) with the person of his main concern, in the case of this dramatic ode not himself but Archytas; then (7-15) gives the succession of special parallel examples, other distinguished figures who have likewise died, Tantalus, Tithonus, Minos, Euphorbus; and finally comes to his generalization (15-16)<sup>46</sup>,

... sed omnis una manet nox  
et calcanda semel via leti.

It is to be noted that in this extremely elaborate ode, the generalization is followed by another series of concrete examples (11-19), dealing this time with classes of men, not individuals<sup>47</sup>, followed by a second generalization (19-20) with *nullum* corresponding to *omnis* above,

... nullum  
saeva caput Proserpina fugit,

and then (21-22) by a return, marked by the use of *me* in 21<sup>48</sup>, to the individual specially concerned<sup>49</sup> (who may or may not be Archytas, again according to one's interpretation of the poem: I believe he is not). Thus the structure of the entire twenty-two lines is really an elaborate chiasmus: (1) 1-6, individual; (2) 7-16, series of examples and generalization from them; (3) 17-20, second series of examples and second generalization; (4) 21-22, individual.

Horace's commoner method is to put the generalization first, and then proceed to illustrate it by a series of examples<sup>50</sup>. As instances of such generalizations, we may cite the following:

3.4.65,  
vis consili expers mole ruit sua<sup>51</sup>;

4.4.29,  
fortes creantur fortibus et bonis;  
Epis. 1.2.3-4 (said of Homer),

... quid sit pulchrum, quid turpe, quid utile,  
quid non,  
planius ac melius Chrysippo et Crantore dicit.

Compare further the illustrative lists that follow the reference to the just and steadfast man in C. 3.3.1, to Pindar's poetical merits in 4.2.9, to Iccius's lofty studies in Epis. 1.12.15.

Occasionally the general statement is both preceded and followed by specific instances. Thus in C. 1.3<sup>52</sup> Horace's animadversions on the dangers of the sea are separated from his recital of man's invasion of other

perilous and forbidden elements by the general comment (25-26),

audax omnia perpeti  
gens humana ruit per vetitum nefas,

which is paralleled a little later by a second philosophical interpolation (37),

nil mortalibus ardui est,

separating three of these elements from a fourth that is in the nature of a climax<sup>53</sup>. In 2.10 a straightforward statement of his thesis (13-15),

sperat infestis, metuit secundis,  
alteram sortem bene praeparatum  
pectus ... ,

follows three metaphorical illustrations (drawn from the sea, houses, heights) and precedes three more (Jupiter, Apollo, the sea again). In 4.8 references to Romulus and Aeacus precede, and references to Hercules, the Dioscuri, and Bacchus follow, the main idea, expressed in 28-29,

dignum laude virum Musa vetat mori:  
caelo Musa beat ...

Sometimes the two sets of examples vary, as in the case of S. 2.1.50-51,

ut quo quisque valet suspectos terreat, utque  
imperet hoc natura potens, sic collige mecum,

which is preceded by the listing of appropriate human beings, Cervius, Vanidia, Turius, and followed by that of appropriate animals, the wolf, the bull<sup>54</sup>. In C. 3.16 the first set of instances (1-16) deal with the power for ill of money already won, and the second set (22-42) with the evil of a desire for still more money than one possesses; these are separated by a philosophical dictum in two parts, which are themselves separated by a personal reference to Maecenas (17-22),

crescentem sequitur cura pecuniam  
maiorumque fames. iure perhorru  
late conspicuum tollere verticem,

Maecenas, equitum decus.

quanto quisque sibi plura negaverit,  
ab dis plura feret ...

But it should be noted that this case is not quite like the others just cited, since the dictum in question belongs more closely in thought with the following than with the preceding illustrations. Moreover, there is another difference in that the generalization is repeated in different terms at the end of the poem 42-44).

... multa petentibus  
desunt multa: bene est, cui deus obtulit  
parca quod satis est manu.

This last practice occurs elsewhere in the Odes, e. g. in 2.13, where three specific examples are enclosed within two variant versions, from slightly different angles, of the same fundamental thought: 13-14,

quid quisque vitet numquam homini satis  
cautum est in horas ...

and 19-20,

... sed improvisa leti  
vis rapuit rapietque gentis.

But the procedure is particularly common in the lengthy discussions in the Satires, where Horace like a good teacher takes no chance of his audience's losing the point, but drives it home by stating it at the beginning and restating it at the end. Compare such variants of his central idea as the following pairs, the two members of which are in each case separated by a series of concrete instances:—S. 1.1.1-3:

qui fit, Maecenas, ut nemo, quam sibi sortem  
seu ratio dederit seu fors obiecerit, illa  
contentus vivat, laudet diversa sequentis?

and 117-119:

inde fit ut raro qui se vixisse beatum  
dicat, et exacto contentus tempore vita  
cedat uti conviva satur, reperire queamus;

1.3.41-42:

vellem in amicitia sic errarem, et isti  
errori nomen virtus posuisse honestum,

and 54:

haec res et iungit iunctos et servat amicos;

ib. 55-56,

at nos virtutes ipsas invertimus atque  
sincerum cupimus vas incrustare, ...

and 66-67,

... eheu,  
quam temere in nosmet legem sancimus iniquam!

1.4.24-25,

... sunt quos genus hoc minime iuvat, utpote  
pluris  
culpari dignos . . . ,

and 33,

omnes hi metuunt versus, odere poetas.

And finally—to borrow a leaf from Horace's own book and return at the close to the point with which we began—we may cite here as an excellent example of the technique at present under consideration the passage in which Horace describes his father's teachings. Starting with the lines which were quoted at the head of this paper (S. 1.4.105-106), he lists the morals drawn by his father from the cases of Albius's son and Baius, of Scetanius, of Trebonius (107-114); then after a brief interlude (115-120) giving his father's justification of his own method, he sums up in general terms (120-121),

... sic me

formabat puerum dictis . . . ;

next (121-126) he gives two more examples offered by his father—*sive iubebat*, one of the special jurymen; *sive vetabat*, so-and-so (*bic atque ille*); and finally he closes his reminiscences by a completely general statement reproducing line 106 in other words, but no longer with reference to his father (128-129),

sic teneros animos aliena opprobria saepe  
abstinent viuis . . .<sup>55</sup>

## NOTES

27Cf. the use of *me quoque*, after a reference to the works of other poets, in Vergil, Georg. 3.8.

28The emphasis here is not on the variety of the forms of death—as it is on the variety of cities admired in 1.7, with Tibur definitely differentiated from the others—but on the inevitability of all forms. (Cf. 15-16 just before our passage, which will be treated again later). Thus despite the occurrence of *aliis* in 1.7.1 and *alios* in 1.28.17, the two passages do not constitute true parallels, and the first is not a justification for assuming that the second starts a new poem, as does Dale (PAPA 54.xvi-xvii). I agree rather with those commentators who believe that the main break in the thought of 1.28, no matter how we interpret it, comes after 22. See my analysis of the passage given below, and cf. note 49.

29Cf. note 15.

30By referring again to Agrippa in the same breath as Augustus (11), Horace does special honor to both. Thus Augustus is given a special post of honor comparable to that which he occupies in 1.2 and 1.12. Cf. also note 14 on 2.12.

31And also by implication, after naming Varius as fit to treat of Agrippa, suggests as parallels for him the writers who have treated of these other heroes, Homer and the tragic poets.

32In *caelum ipsum* (38) there is perhaps a note of climax. Note that here we have the one domain that man has not yet succeeded in reaching.

33The simplest type does not seem to occur in Horace. This is merely a series of parallels, with the emphasis on the last member, as in Vergil, Ecl. 2.63-65, 3.80-83, 7.61-68, or on the first member, as in 10.29-30. For other examples of the series from the Eclogues, see notes 34, 37, 39, 40, 41.

34Cf. Vergil, Ecl. 1.23-24, 5.32-34, 45-47. The comparison in Ecl. 7.37-44 may also be cited.

35However, this is a little too long and elaborate to be really typical of the form of writing under consideration here.

36Cf. *quanta* in Ep. 4.1-2, cited in note 38.

37Cf. Vergil, Ecl. 5.76-78, Aen. 1.607-609.

38Cf. Vergil, Ecl. 1.60-65. A comparable example from Horace involving a single item instead of a series is C. 1.33-7-9, quoted below. Cf. too, Ep. 4.1-2 (already referred to in note 36),

lupis et agnis quanta sortito obtigit,  
tecum mihi discordia est,

which, however, is presented as a straightforward statement, not as an *adynaton* involving the reversal of the normal situation.

39Cf. Vergil, Ecl. 8.27-28, 52-56.

40Or, in Vergil's fourth Eclogue, to a special period, the Golden Age.

41There is some, but not complete, overlapping in Vergil, Ecl. 2.63-65, cited in note 33, and 5.32-34, cited in note 34.

42On the last lines see note 38.

43With the possible exception of those listed in note 16.

44Here the enumeration of various cities is for a quite different purpose from that in C. 1.7, where Horace is simply leading up to his own preference.

45Already discussed in part above. See especially note 28.

46The same conclusion is reached in C. 3.1.9-16,

est ut viro vir latius ordinet  
arbusta sulcis, hic generosior  
descendat in Campum petitor,

moribus hic meliorque fama

contendat, illi turba clientium  
sit maior: aequa lege Necessitas  
sortitur insignis et imos;  
omne capax movet urna nomen.

Here, however, it must be noted that the generalization does not follow logically from the previous passage, which simply enumerates (as does 1.1) the various pursuits in which individuals engage, here with special emphasis on the excellence of each in his chosen field, but fails to prepare us for the conclusion that each must die.

47This is referred to again in note 54.

48With this *me*, *tu* of line 23 presents a faint contrast (cf. the supplementary introduction of a personal contrast as furnished by *tu* and *me* in 2.12, already discussed. There is also a faint contrast between *quoque* and *at*. The idea is: 'Like all these others, I, too, am dead. Your part, on the other hand, (living) sailor, is to bury me.' However, the idea of contrast should not be pressed, since it is not necessarily inherent in Horace's employment of the emphatic *tu* with a personal command (cf. his use of it in 1.9.16 and—an even better parallel because it occurs at the outset of his behest—in 1.11.1).

49Cf. the introductory note in Moore's edition: 'The last two verses of this part close the illustrations with the speaker's personal experience in the true Horatian manner.'

50This is Virgil's method in Georg. 3.242-283 (already referred to in note 22), which he begins with an introductory statement (242-244) applying to the animal kingdom in general before proceeding to observations concerning different species.

51Note that in this passage he clearly reveals his procedure by adding (69-70),

testis mearum centimanus Gyas  
sententiarum, ...

52Already discussed above.

53See note 32.

54Cf. the Archytas passage dealt with at length above, where the first set (7-15) of persons comprise individuals, and the second set (17-20) types.

55But this is not quite the end: as so often when he is at his most serious, he turns the whole discussion off with, and into, a joke which does not in the least detract from his general earnestness. And the very joke still maintains the pattern. Horace gives us first a general statement about his disposition: thanks to his training, he says, his faults are only slight and excusable ones—130-131, *mediocribus et quis ignoscas vitiis teneor*. Perhaps even of these he will eventually be cured; meanwhile he keeps up the good work that his father started, by meditating in concrete terms as he has been taught to do—134-137 (quoted above). The result of his meditations he writes down when he has the opportunity. Is this still another step on the way to being cured of even his slight and excusable faults? By no means, says Horace (139-144) with a reversal that is O. Henry-like in its unexpectedness; this is one of those slight faults which he has admitted characterize him; and if you will not excuse him for it, he will force you to do so!

E. ADELAIDE HAHN

HUNTER COLLEGE

#### ARISTOTLE ON METAPHOR

Poetics 1459a5-8: πολὺ τὸ μέγιστον τὸ μεταφορικὸν ἔιναι μόνον γὰρ τοῦτο οὐτε παρά' ἄλλον ἔστι λαβεῖν εὐφνίας τε σημείον ἔστι· τὸ γὰρ εὖ μεταφέρειν τὸ ὅμοιον θεωρεῖν ἔστιν.

A. E. Housman, *The Name and Nature of Poetry* (1933), pp. 10f: 'simile and metaphor, things inessential to poetry.'

Aristotle has already (1457b7-34) defined metaphor as 'the application of an alien name by transference either from genus to species, or from species to genus, or from species to species, or by analogy,' the last type implying a proportion; e. g. 'as old age is to life, so is evening to day.' Evening may therefore be called "the old age of the day," and old age, "the evening of life," or, in the phrase of Empedocles, "life's setting sun". A few pages later (1459a12-14; cf. 1459b35) he remarks that, of unusual words, compounds are best suited to dithyrambs, rare words (or indeed all kinds) to heroic verse, and metaphors to iambic, since they are found also in the prose which it resembles. Having stated (1458a18) that 'the perfection of style is to be clear without being mean,' and that the latter quality is realized by the use of 'unusual words', including metaphorical words, he gives the warning that the excessive use of metaphor results in a riddling style, and that moderation and propriety must be exercised (1458b12-15; 1459a4). Then follows our text, printed above, which Butcher translates as follows: 'But the greatest thing by far is to have a command of metaphor. This alone cannot be imparted by another; it is the mark of genius, for to make good metaphors implies an eye for resemblances.' The pleasure afforded by metaphor may be explained by the previous statement (1448b15-17, following the explanation of the origin of poetry as grounded in the pleasure that we feel in things imitated, as well as in rhythm): 'Thus the reason why men enjoy seeing a likeness is that in contemplating it they find themselves learning or inferring, and saying perhaps. "Ah, that is he!"'

These principles are restated and developed in the Third Book of the Rhetoric. Perspicuity is the virtue of style; but variety is to be sought, investing language with a foreign air and thus exciting wonder. Though such deviations from the norm should be sparingly admitted in prose, yet metaphor is suitable because of its universal use, especially since prose has fewer aids than verse (III, 2, 6-8. Cf. Isocrates, Evag. 8-11, complaining that poets have in this respect an advantage over prose writers.) Metaphor contributes lucidity, pleasure, and a foreign air, and can not be derived from any one else (III, 2, 8). It must be used with propriety; the test is the existence of a proportion between the terms; otherwise either mere adornment or disparagement will result (III, 2, 9-11). A metaphor should not be far-fetched, but derived from things whose kinship is recognizable, as in a well-constructed riddle (III, 2, 12); and should deal with things beautiful in sound or significance (III, 2, 13). A simile is merely an expanded metaphor, and should be convertible with it; but it is more appropriate to poetry

than to prose (III, 11, 11; cf. III, 6, 3). Metaphor appeals to our natural pleasure in learning easily; it mediates between what is rare and perhaps unintelligible and what is too familiar; thus it affords a satisfaction comparable to that of the philosopher whose sagacity discerns resemblances in widely differing things, and is akin to the intellectual pleasure, next discussed, of the witticism that depends on temporary deception and subsequent enlightenment, the surprise of paradox (III, 10, 2; 11, 5). Of the four types of metaphor enumerated in the Poetics, the most popular is the proportional; among many other examples, Aristotle attributes to Pericles the saying that 'the youth had perished from the city in the war as if one were to take the spring out of the year' (III, 10, 7). Finally Aristotle prefers metaphors that suggest activity or that treat inanimate objects as animate (III, 11, 2-4).

The work of Demetrius, On Style, so far as metaphor is concerned, does not add much to Aristotle, but restates the principles as they affect the 'elevated' style, with practical hints and excellent examples §§78-90). Since all the Greek critics, Aristotle included, feel it necessary to apologize for or even to condemn as far-fetched many a metaphor that we should readily accept, we must remember that metaphors which to us appear worn and traditional were once novel; we are more apt to apologize, if at all, for hackneyed metaphors. Usage (*συριθεία*), remarks Demetrius, is our teacher everywhere, and especially as to metaphor; 'usage, in fact, clothes almost all conceptions in metaphor, and that with such a sure touch that we are hardly conscious of it. It calls a voice "silvery," a man "keen," a character "rugged," a speaker "long," and so on with metaphors in general, which are applied so tastefully that they pass for literal description' (§86). But there is always room for the 'genius' whose 'eye for resemblances' will find fresh metaphors. And we shall agree with 'Longinus' that the piling up of metaphors may be justified by the torrent of passion (§ 32); and that the use of familiar language in metaphors may be saved by expressiveness, and may be only the more convincing because it is drawn from common life and is thus understood at once (§ 31).

To lucidity, then, metaphor (or some other kind of trope) adds power; by the force of suggestion it appeals to the emotions and to the imagination, as well as to the reason. For the trope, 'turning aside' from literal statement, substitutes for the truth of reason a truth of image or of feeling. By the suggestion of a surprising, but not too startling, likeness between two things that to the careless thinker appear unlike, it gratifies the craving for novelty. By leaving most of the details of the comparison to the mind of the audience, the metaphor, or even the simile, allows the audience to feel that it has discovered them. Shakespeare's 'the eye of heaven' implies a complete analogy:

'The sun is to the heaven as the eye is to the body;' but how banal and how much less moving is the full statement than the brief metaphor! Moreover, metaphor is natural to children, to early peoples, and to poets; they all turn more easily to concrete images than to logical statement. If Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in his work On Literary Composition, had not been so much concerned with the order of words, he would have found the magic of Homer's style to depend not only on this element but in part also on the 'noble metaphors' which, he observes, are lacking in the passage selected for quotation (Chap. 3; Od. 16, 1-16). Thus Pope (or one of his assistants) in the Essay on Homer's Battles appended to the translation of the Iliad (Vol. II, pp. 49f, ed. of 1771) remarks that Homer contrives 'such reliefs and pauses as might divert the mind to some other scene without losing sight of his principal object. . . A comparison . . . is at once correspondent to, and differing from the subject. [This is *not* distracting.] For it is with the eye of the imagination as it is with our corporeal eye, it must sometimes be taken off from the object, in order to see it the better.' Where prose goes straight to the point, poetry by indirection or the devious methods of the trope reaches its goal more triumphantly, and sometimes even more rapidly.

What then are we to make of Housman's dictum that simile and metaphor are 'things inessential to poetry'? First, that Housman was rebuking those eighteenth-century poets who substituted for real poetic feeling an elaborate system of conceits and verbal riddling; and in this he was right, and was in accord with Aristotle. For metaphor is worse than nothing, if it is not 'appropriate', and if it does not enlighten as well as startle the reader. And, second, Housman was presently going on to launch his 'pit of the stomach' theory of poetic origins and effects, a theory valid enough for his own and for some other good poetry, though not for all. And finally we may turn from Housman the critic to Housman the poet. On page after page of his three slender volumes of verse one could christen the innumerable tropes out of the handbooks. Let one familiar example suffice:

About the woodlands I will go  
To see the cherry hung with snow.

The poem which it closes doubtless satisfies the 'pit of the stomach'; and 'snow' for 'bloom' is almost traditional. Nevertheless the metaphor lifts the whole poem into the realm of magic.

WILLIAM C. GREENE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

### AN ANCIENT INSTANCE OF TAX FORGIVENESS

Because of the peculiar circumstance that Rome (indeed, in the main, even Italy) was during the greater part of its history exempt from direct taxation, Latin authors seldom mention tax problems. The burden fell chiefly upon the provincials, and so was only of academic or humanitarian concern, except to the corporations which farmed the revenues. The references to agitation for *tabulae novae* and to imprisonment for debt are of a different character, for the indebtedness was contracted to individuals. Hence, certain sections of Pliny's Panegyric in honor of Trajan (§§37-40) acquire heightened interest because they deal with a directly laid government impost, the inheritance tax, which still constitutes a profitable source of state income, and because Trajan's policy involved cancellation of an accrued but unpaid obligation, which has in recent years assumed topical significance from congressional debate.

In this portion of Pliny's speech, he thanks the emperor for remitting the five per cent exaction on modest legacies involving relatives of those who had acquired Roman citizenship by the *ius Latii* or by imperial favor. This tax, initiated by Augustus, was not laid on *veteres cives*, but only on those who still had ties with their non-Roman birthplace. By the *ius Latii*, residents of Latium or of equally privileged *coloniae* might become citizens if they held public office in their native town, if they settled in Rome, or if they were owners of a ship, a gristmill, or a dwelling. Under Nerva's predecessors, however, since the new citizen's relatives remained non-Roman unless the privilege of *cognatio* had been bestowed along with citizenship, he could not inherit from them or make a bequest to them without incurring the tax which was assessed against bequests from non-relatives. Nerva had relaxed this stringent legalism—"more sparingly," as Pliny remarks, "than befitted the best of sovereigns, but not more so than befitted the best of fathers, who thereby reserved for his adopted son an ample and nearly untouched sphere for generosity"—by allowing mothers to inherit from their daughters and daughters from their mothers, regardless of whether both were citizens, and fathers from their sons and sons from their fathers, if the parent still exercised the *patria potestas*. Trajan had gone farther, and not only removed the qualification concerning the *patria potestas*, but dropped the barriers against untaxed bequests involving those in the second degree of *cognatio*, brother and sister, grandfather or grandmother and grandson or granddaughter.

Trajan's liberality, however, did not end there. It was the usual thing for imperial edicts to operate retroactively only in individual cases and in response to a petition laid before the ruling princeps. But Trajan ordered that not only those who subsequently became

new citizens were to enjoy the immunity, but all those then so classified. Furthermore, and most surprisingly, he decreed that whoever still owed the treasury for the tax now lifted were not to be prosecuted in order to obtain collection; if they were not liable under the new formula, the indebtedness was to be disregarded. One may, I think, warrantably assume that the proclamation was received with very different emotions by those who had fulfilled their obligation to the collector and by those who were in arrears, since amounts already paid were not to be refunded. Many must have felt themselves hardly used and resented the leniency accorded to the delinquent.

Indeed, it is an interesting speculation whether Pliny himself, whose politico-economic views were at most liberal conservative, actually greeted the step with all the enthusiasm which he professed. Even so, he had carefully prepared the way for his eulogy by the vehemence with which he denounced the iniquity of the tax. He begins by declaring that it was not imposed on citizens' inheritances from relatives because they would not readily tolerate a state levy: *quae sanguine, gentilitate, sacrorum denique societate meruisse quaeque numquam ut aliena et speranda, sed ut sua semperque possessa ac deinceps proximo cuique transmittenda cepissent.*

Only those originally alien were subjected to a burden which made acquisition of Roman citizenship a cause for hatred, discord, and childlessness, since, as he says: *carissima pignora salva ipsorum pietate distraheret*. Galba, he asserts, had granted partial relief, on these grounds: *improbe et insolenter ac paene impie his nominibus inseri publicanum nec sine piaculo quodam sanctissimas necessitudines velut intercedente vicesima scindi*. Trajan's elimination of the proviso that the *patria potestas* must be in force calls forth even more pathos: *Egregie, Caesar, quod lacrimas parentum vestigiales esse non patetis*. So also in: *Nemo recentem et attonitam orbitatem ad computationem vocet cogatque patrem quid reliquerit filius scire*. Exemption of relatives in the second degree is noted: *sparsas atque, ut ita dicam, laceras gentilitates colligere atque concretare et quasi renasci iubere*.

These flights of rhetoric leave the reader not wholly unprepared for the supreme stroke with which he praises Trajan's remission of tax delinquency: *At in praeteritum subvenire ne di quidem possunt: tu tamen subvenisti cavistique ut desineret quisque debere quod non esset postea debiturus, id est, effecisti ne malos principes habuissemus*. Yet, despite allowances for the exaggeration inherent in panegyric, it is hard to recognize the sober Pliny in the speaker. His emotionalism may serve to illuminate, if not to justify, the ebullitions of our congressmen in recent discussions of income tax reform.

CHARLES S. RAYMENT  
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN